Leading order covariant chiral nucleon-nucleon interaction

Xiu-Lei Ren,[1] Kai-Wen Li,[2] Li-Sheng Geng,[2,3,*] Bingwei Long,[4] Peter Ring,[5,1] and Jie Meng[1,2,†]

[1]*State Key Laboratory of Nuclear Physics and Technology, School of Physics, Peking University, Beijing 100871, China*
[2]*School of Physics and Nuclear Energy Engineering & International Research Center for Nuclei and Particles in the Cosmos, Beihang University, Beijing 100191, China*
[3]*Beijing Key Laboratory of Advanced Nuclear Materials and Physics, Beihang University, Beijing 100191, China*
[4]*Center for Theoretical Physics, Department of Physics, Sichuan University, Chengdu, Sichuan 610064, China*
[5]*Physik Department, Technische Universität München, D-85748 Garching, Germany*

(Dated: November 28, 2016)

Motivated by the successes of relativistic theories in studies of atomic/molecular and nuclear systems and the strong need for a covariant chiral force in relativistic nuclear structure studies, we develop a new covariant scheme to construct the nucleon-nucleon interaction in the framework of chiral effective field theory. The chiral interaction is formulated up to leading order with a covariant power counting and a Lorentz invariant chiral Lagrangian. We find that the covariant scheme induces all the six invariant spin operators needed to describe the nuclear force, which are also helpful to achieve cutoff independence for certain partial waves. A detailed investigation of the partial wave potentials shows a better description of the scattering phase shifts with low angular momenta than the leading order Weinberg approach. Particularly, the description of the $^1S_0$, $^3P_0$, and $^1P_1$ partial waves is similar to that of the next-to-leading order Weinberg approach. Our study shows that the relativistic framework presents a more efficient formulation of the chiral nuclear force.

PACS numbers: 13.75.Cs,21.30.-x

arXiv:1611.08475v1 [nucl-th] 25 Nov 2016

Introduction: There is strong evidence that relativistic effects play an indispensable role in our understanding of the fine structure of atoms/molecules [1] and nuclei [2], although non-relativistic methods were historically very popular and are still routinely utilized in modern studies. The most familiar manifestations of relativistic effects include the appearance of anti-fermions, their spin and the resulting spin-orbit interactions, which are key to understand the spin-orbit splitting of atomic spectra and nuclear single particle levels [3]. In contrast to kinematical effects which, at low energies, can often be neglected or treated perturbatively, these are dynamical effects. Today, studies of complex atomic/molecular systems have achieved a high level of maturity [4], while similar studies of nuclear structure and reactions are still at an early stage [5]. A key difference in microscopic studies of atoms/molecules and nuclei, though sharing similar theoretical approaches, is the dominating fundamental interaction. For atoms/molecules, the electromagnetic force is known rather accurately both at the classical level and at the field theoretical level. On the other hand, for nuclei, the nuclear force, being a residual interaction of the strong force, is still far from being completely understood (see, e.g., Ref. [6]).

After more than 80 years of extensive study since the pion-exchange picture was proposed [7], the nuclear force still remains a central topic in nuclear physics and nuclear astrophysics. There are a variety of formulations of the nuclear force. Most studies are performed in the non-relativistic (NR) framework, such as the high precision phenomenological nuclear potentials, Reid93 [8] and Argonne V_{18} [9], or the accurate chiral forces [10–12], firstly proposed by Weinberg in 1990s [13, 14] (see the reviews [15–17] for more details). In the relativistic framework, only two formulations have been studied rather extensively, namely the (CD-)Bonn potential [18, 19] and the covariant spectator theory [20, 21]. Among them, the Bonn potential has been successfully applied in relativistic many-body calculations (e.g. Dirac-Brueckner-Hartree-Fock theory [22]), to study both nuclear matter [23] and, more recently, finite nuclei [24]. However, the connection of the Bonn potential to the underlying theory of the strong interaction, Quantum Chromodynamics (QCD), is not very transparent. In this regard, a relativistic nucleon-nucleon interaction based on chiral effective field theory (ChEFT) is in urgent need.

As a low energy effective field theory of non-perturbative QCD [25], ChEFT provides a model independent approach to study strong-interaction phenomena. It has been successfully applied to the mesonic sector and the systems involving baryons and heavy (flavored) hadrons. Due to the large non-zero mass of the nucleon in the chiral limit (compared to the pion mass), in the latter systems, conventionally the NR ChEFT, i.e. the heavy baryon (HB) scheme [26], is often used. However, in recent years, the covariant ChEFT has been shown to be able to solve a

*Email: lisheng.geng@buaa.edu.cn
†Email: mengj@pku.edu.cn

number of long-standing issues and exhibited relatively faster convergence than its NR counterpart in the one baryon sector [27–30] and in heavy-light systems [31], in addition to being fully covariant and satisfying analyticity constraints (see Ref. [32] for a short review). Motivated by these successes and the demand in relativistic nuclear structure studies, in the present work, we construct the fully covariant NN interaction up to leading order (LO) in the covariant ChEFT and explore the corresponding relativistic effects. Such a formulation may offer some new insights into the nuclear forces based on ChEFT. In the long run, we aim to provide a high-precision relativistic chiral nuclear force so that relativistic many-body calculations, such as those of Refs. [23, 24], can be performed with chiral forces.

In this Letter, we start from the manifestly Lorentz invariant chiral Lagrangians and construct the fully covariant chiral force up to leading order in ChEFT with the covariant power counting. In the $|LSJ\rangle$ basis, the partial wave potentials are shown to differ from those of the non-relativistic formulation, which hints that cutoff independence and a better description of certain partial waves might be achieved. We then utilize a three-dimensional reduction of the Bethe-Salpeter equation and iterate the potential kernel to fit the Nijmegen partial wave phase shifts. It is shown that, for the first time, one can achieve a satisfactory description of the phase shifts of low angular momenta at LO, which are attributed to the more efficient relativistic formulation of the nuclear force. The quality of the fit is much better than the corresponding LO Weinberg formulation and similar to that of the next-to-leading order (NLO) but with fewer low-energy constants.

Theoretical framework: To construct an explicitly covariant chiral nucleon-nucleon interaction, we introduce a covariant power counting, namely, we start from the covariant chiral Lagrangians, retain the full form of Dirac spinors, and use naive dimensional analysis to determine the chiral dimension of a Feynman diagram, different from the mostly-used Weinberg power counting [13] or the modified Weinberg power counting [33].

In our framework, the Dirac spinor has the usual form,

$$u(\vec{p},s)=N_p\begin{pmatrix}1\\ \frac{\vec{\sigma}\cdot\vec{p}}{\epsilon_p}\end{pmatrix}\chi_s,\quad N_p=\sqrt{\frac{\epsilon_p}{2M_N}}, \tag{1}$$

where the nucleon energy is $E_p=\sqrt{M_N^2+\vec{p}^{\,2}}$, and $\epsilon_p=E_p+M_N$. The Pauli spinor, χ_s, denotes the spin of the nucleon. The chiral dimension (n_χ) of a Feynman diagram with L loops is calculated in the following way

$$n_\chi=4L-2N_\pi-N_n+\sum_k kV_k, \tag{2}$$

where N_π (N_n) is the number of internal pion (nucleon) propagators, and V_k is the number of vertices from kth-order Lagrangians. The small expansion parameter in the covariant power counting is the pion mass or the three momentum of the nucleon, as in the one-baryon sector.

According to the above power counting, at leading order one needs to compute the Feynman diagrams shown in Fig. 1. The relevant covariant effective Lagrangians are

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff.}}=\mathcal{L}^{(2)}_{\pi\pi}+\mathcal{L}^{(1)}_{\pi N}+\mathcal{L}^{(0)}_{NN}, \tag{3}$$

where the superscript denotes the chiral dimension. The lowest order $\pi\pi$ and πN Lagrangians read

$$\mathcal{L}^{(2)}_{\pi\pi} = \frac{f_\pi^2}{4}\text{Tr}\left[\partial_\mu U\partial^\mu U^\dagger+(U+U^\dagger)m_\pi^2\right], \tag{4}$$

$$\mathcal{L}^{(1)}_{\pi N} = \bar{\Psi}\left[i\not{D}-M_N+\frac{g_A}{2}\gamma^\mu\gamma_5 u_\mu\right]\Psi, \tag{5}$$

with the pion decay constant $f_\pi=92.4$ MeV and the axial vector coupling $g_A=1.267$ [34]. The SU(2) matrix $U=u^2=\exp\left(\frac{i\Phi}{f_\pi}\right)$ where Φ is a traceless matrix involving pion fields, while the nucleon fields Ψ are collected in a column vector,

$$\Phi=\begin{pmatrix}\pi^0 & \sqrt{2}\pi^+\\ \sqrt{2}\pi^- & -\pi^0\end{pmatrix},\quad \Psi=\begin{pmatrix}p\\ n\end{pmatrix}. \tag{6}$$

The covariant derivative of Ψ is defined as

$$D_\mu\Psi = \partial_\mu\Psi+[\Gamma_\mu,\Psi], \tag{7}$$

$$\Gamma_\mu = \frac{1}{2}\left(u^\dagger\partial_\mu u+u\partial_\mu u^\dagger\right), \tag{8}$$

and the axial current u_μ is

$$u_\mu = i\left(u^\dagger \partial_\mu u - u\partial_\mu u^\dagger\right). \tag{9}$$

The covariant form of four-fermion contact terms are provided by the following Lagrangian,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}^{(0)}_{NN} &= \frac{1}{2}\left[C_S(\bar\Psi\Psi)(\bar\Psi\Psi) + C_A(\bar\Psi\gamma_5\Psi)(\bar\Psi\gamma_5\Psi)\right.\\ &+ C_V(\bar\Psi\gamma_\mu\Psi)(\bar\Psi\gamma^\mu\Psi) + C_{AV}(\bar\Psi\gamma_\mu\gamma_5\Psi)(\bar\Psi\gamma^\mu\gamma_5\Psi)\\ &+ \left. C_T(\bar\Psi\sigma_{\mu\nu}\Psi)(\bar\Psi\sigma^{\mu\nu}\Psi)\right],\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

where $C_{S,A,V,AV,T}$ are the five unknown low-energy constants (LECs). The above Lagrangian has the same form as that given in Ref. [35].

In momentum space, denoting the center-of-mass initial (final) momentum by p (p'), the transferred momentum $q = p' - p$ and the average momentum $k = \frac{1}{2}(p' + p)$, the lowest order chiral force can be written as

$$V_{\rm LO} = V_{\rm CTP} + V_{\rm OPEP}, \tag{11}$$

where the four-fermion contact potential (CTP) is

$$\begin{aligned}V_{\rm CTP} &= C_S(\bar u_1 u_1)(\bar u_2 u_2) + C_A(\bar u_1\gamma_5 u_1)(\bar u_2\gamma_5 u_2)\\ &+ C_V(\bar u_1\gamma_\mu u_1)(\bar u_2\gamma^\mu u_2)\\ &+ C_{AV}(\bar u_1\gamma_\mu\gamma_5 u_1)(\bar u_2\gamma^\mu\gamma_5 u_2)\\ &+ C_T(\bar u_1\sigma_{\mu\nu} u_1)(\bar u_2\sigma_{\mu\nu} u_2),\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

and the "well-known" one-pion-exchange potential (OPEP) has the familiar form [51]

$$V_{\rm OPEP} = -\frac{g_A^2}{4f_\pi^2}\vec\tau_1\cdot\vec\tau_2\frac{(\bar u_1\gamma^\mu\gamma_5 q_\mu u_1)(\bar u_2\gamma^\nu\gamma_5 q_\nu u_2)}{q^2 - m_\pi^2}, \tag{13}$$

where $\vec\tau$ is the isospin Pauli matrix.

Expressing $V_{\rm LO}$ in terms of the Pauli operators, one can easily see that the covariant contact and OPE potentials contain all the six spin operators needed to describe the nuclear force [36], respectively,

$$\begin{aligned}&1,\quad \vec\sigma_1\cdot\vec\sigma_2,\quad \frac{i}{2}(\vec\sigma_1+\vec\sigma_2)\cdot(\vec k\times\vec q),\quad \vec\sigma_1\cdot\vec q\vec\sigma_2\cdot\vec q,\\ &\vec\sigma_1\cdot\vec k\vec\sigma_2\cdot\vec k,\quad \vec\sigma_1\cdot(\vec q\times\vec k)\vec\sigma_2\cdot(\vec q\times\vec k),\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

especially the spin-orbit force. In the static limit, Eq. (11) reduces to the LO chiral force in the HB scheme,

$$V^{\rm HB} = (C_S + C_V) - (C_{AV} - 2C_T)\vec\sigma_1\cdot\vec\sigma_2 - \frac{g_A^2}{4f_\pi^2}\vec\tau_1\cdot\vec\tau_2\frac{\vec\sigma_1\cdot\vec q\vec\sigma_2\cdot\vec q}{\vec q^2 + m_\pi^2}, \tag{15}$$

which only contains the central, spin-spin and tensor interactions. It is important to note that at LO the covariant power counting introduces three more LECs than the Weinberg approach. The interesting consequences can be seen in the contributions of the contact terms to different partial waves in the $|LSJ\rangle$ basis,

$$V_{1S0} = \xi_N\left[C_{1S0}\left(1 + R_p^2R_{p'}^2\right) + \hat C_{1S0}\left(R_p^2 + R_{p'}^2\right)\right],$$

FIG. 1: Feynman diagrams contributing to the nucleon-nucleon interaction at leading order in the covariant power counting. Solid lines denote nucleons and the dash line represents the pion. A box denotes the vertex from $\mathcal{L}^{(0)}_{NN}$, while the dots refer to vertices from $\mathcal{L}^{(1)}_{\pi N}$.

TABLE I: Values of the five leading order LECs (in unit of 10^4GeV^{-2}) from the best fit (see text for details).

LECs	C_S	C_A	C_V	C_{AV}	C_T
Best fit	-0.13515 ± 0.00307	0.055963 ± 0.018217	0.26857 ± 0.01151	0.24427 ± 0.01141	0.062538 ± 0.001319

$$
\begin{aligned}
V_{3P0} &= -2\xi_N C_{3P0} R_p R_{p'}, \\
V_{1P1} &= -\frac{2\xi_N}{3} C_{1P1} R_p R_{p'}, \\
V_{3P1} &= -\frac{4\xi_N}{3} C_{3P1} R_p R_{p'}, \\
V_{3S1} &= \frac{\xi_N}{9}\left[C_{3S1}\left(9 + R_p^2 R_{p'}^2\right) + \hat{C}_{3S1}\left(R_p^2 + R_{p'}^2\right)\right], \\
V_{3D1} &= \frac{8\xi_N}{9} C_{3S1} R_p^2 R_{p'}^2, \\
V_{3S1-3D1} &= \frac{2\sqrt{2}\xi_N}{9}\left(C_{3S1} R_p^2 R_{p'}^2 + \hat{C}_{3S1} R_p^2\right), \\
V_{3D1-3S1} &= \frac{2\sqrt{2}\xi_N}{9}\left(C_{3S1} R_p^2 R_{p'}^2 + \hat{C}_{3S1} R_{p'}^2\right),
\end{aligned} \tag{16}
$$

where $\xi_N = 4\pi N_p^2 N_{p'}^2$, $R_p = |\vec{p}|/\epsilon_p$, and $R_{p'} = |\vec{p}'|/\epsilon_{p'}$. The seven combinations of the LECs $C_{S,A,V,AV,T}$ are

$$
\begin{aligned}
C_{1S0} &= (C_S + C_V + 3C_{AV} - 6C_T), \\
\hat{C}_{1S0} &= (3C_V + C_A + C_{AV} + 6C_T), \\
C_{3P0} &= (C_S - 4C_V + C_A - 4C_{AV}), \\
C_{1P1} &= (C_S + C_A), \\
C_{3P1} &= (C_S - 2C_V - C_A + 2C_{AV} + 4C_T), \\
C_{3S1} &= (C_S + C_V - C_{AV} + 2C_T), \\
\hat{C}_{3S1} &= 3(C_V - C_A - C_{AV} + 2C_T).
\end{aligned} \tag{17}
$$

One can see that $V_{\rm CTP}$ contributes to all partial waves with $J = 0$, 1 in the covariant power counting, different from the (modified) Weinberg approach, where the contact term only contributes to the ${}^1S_0$ and ${}^3S_1$ partial waves. This is because the LO covariant chiral force contains some of the higher order contributions of the NR nuclear force. For instance, the leading order relativistic corrections in V_{1S0} and V_{3P0} have the same form as those introduced in the "renormalization group invariant" formulation proposed in Refs. [37–40]. As we will see later, these terms also make the ${}^1S_0$ and ${}^3P_0$ channels cutoff independent in our scheme. For the OPEP, one can repeat the above procedure to obtain the corresponding potentials for all the partial waves, and the covariant power counting also contains some nominally high-order corrections in the Weinberg power counting.

To make things more transparent, we can decompose the covariant potential into a sum of the static contribution and the relativistic corrections. For instance, the ${}^1S_0$ partial wave potential [Eq. (16)] can be expanded in terms of $1/M_N$, and one obtains

$$
V_{1S0} = 4\pi\left[C_{1S0} + (C_{1S0} + \hat{C}_{1S0})\left(\frac{\vec{p}^2 + \vec{p}'^2}{4M_N^2} + \cdots\right)\right] + \frac{\pi g_A^2}{2f_\pi^2}\int_{-1}^{1}\frac{dz}{\vec{q}^2 + m_\pi^2}\left[\vec{q}^2 - \left(\frac{(\vec{p}^2 - \vec{p}'^2)^2}{4M_N^2} + \cdots\right)\right], \tag{18}
$$

where z is the cosine of the angle between the two momenta $\vec{p}$ and $\vec{p}'$. It is easy to single out the static contributions because the relativistic corrections are suppressed by M_N^{2n} $(n = 1, 2, \cdots)$ with the large nucleon mass $M_N \sim \Lambda_\chi \sim 1$ GeV. In the covariant power counting, this argument is only true for OPEP, where the same coefficient, $\pi g_A^2/(2f_\pi^2)$, multiplies both the static contribution and the relativistic corrections. However, the situation for the contact interaction is different where an independent parameter, $(C_{1S0} + \hat{C}_{1S0})$, determines the relativistic corrections of the CTP. Therefore, one has to be careful to deal with this term since the magnitude of $(C_{1S0} + \hat{C}_{1S0})$ cannot be reliably estimated from naive dimensional analysis, which is only useful to evaluate the values of LECs $C_{S,A,V,AV,T}$ appearing in the chiral Lagrangian.

To make a quantitative statement, one has to determine the values of LECs by fitting to the NN scattering data, such as the partial wave phase shifts. Because the nuclear force is non-perturbative, in the covariant framework,

one should iterate the potential by solving the Bethe-Salpeter (BS) equation [41] to determine the phase shifts. However, in practice, this is difficult and one often utilizes a three-dimensional reduction of the BS equation, e.g., the Blenkenbecklar-Sugar (BbS) equation [42], or the Kadyshevsky equation [43]. In this work, we employ the Kadyshevsky equation [52], which possesses a weaker cutoff dependence as shown in Refs. [33, 44],

$$T(p',p) = V(p',p) + \int_0^{+\infty} \frac{k^2 dk}{(2\pi)^3} V(p',k) \frac{2\pi M_N^2}{k^2+M_N^2} \times \frac{1}{(\sqrt{p^2+M_N^2}-\sqrt{k^2+M_N^2}+i\epsilon)} T(k,p). \tag{19}$$

In solving the above scattering equation, consistent with the derivation of the Kadyshevsky equation, we employ the so-called "on-mass-shell" approximation for the potential. Furthermore, to remove ultraviolet divergences or facilitate numerical calculations, the potential have to be regularized. Here, we choose the commonly used Gaussian cutoff function [45],

$$V_{\rm LO} \to V_{\rm LO}^{\rm Reg.} = V_{\rm LO} \exp\left(\frac{-\vec{p}^{2n}-\vec{p}'^{2n}}{\Lambda^{2n}}\right), \tag{20}$$

with $n = 2$. In the Weinberg approach, the momentum cutoff Λ is usually varied between 550 MeV and 950 MeV.

Numerically, we follow the strategy of Ref. [46] to simultaneously describe the $J = 0,\ 1$ Nijmegen partial wave phase shifts of the np channel at 1, 5, 10, 25, 50, 100 MeV laboratory kinetic energy ($E_{\rm lab}$) [47]. As an exploratory study at LO, the intention is not to achieve a precise descriptions of the NN data but to check quantitatively the covariant power counting. In addition, the low energy partial wave phase shifts have very small uncertainties compared to higher chiral order contributions neglected at our LO study. Therefore, the errors of phase shifts are not included in the fit-$\tilde{\chi}^2$, which is defined as $\tilde{\chi}^2 = (\delta_{\rm LO} - \delta_{\rm PWA})^2$. For the other parameters, the pion and nucleon masses are fixed at $m_\pi = 138.00$ MeV, $M_N = 938.92$ MeV in the isospin symmetric limit, and $f_\pi = 92.4$ MeV, $g_A = 1.267$.

Results and discussion: The best fit result of $\tilde{\chi}^2$/d.o.f. is shown, in Fig. 2, as a function of the momentum cutoff Λ changing from 550 MeV to 950 MeV. The minimum of $\tilde{\chi}^2$/d.o.f. equals to 2.9 when $\Lambda = 747$ MeV. The values of the LECs $C_{S,A,V,AV,T}$ obtained from the best fit are listed in Table I. We note that their values are of similar magnitude.

With the best fit LECs in the relativistic LO NN potential, the description of the Nijmegen multienergy np phase shifts [47] and the VPI/GWU single-energy np analysis [48] up to $E_{\rm lab} = 300$ MeV are shown in Fig. 3.[53] The data of the latter analysis are not included in our fits. The gray backgrounds denote the theoretical predictions. For comparison, the results of the LO non-relativistic chiral force of Ref. [45] are also given. One can see that the relativistic formulation can improve the description of the $^1S_0$, $^3P_0$ and $^1P_1$ phase shifts, especially that of the $^1S_0$, in comparison with the LO non-relativistic results. For the other four partial waves with $J = 1$, the LO relativistic and non-relativisitc results are quantitatively similar to, except the mixing angle ε_1.

To understand the improvement in the $^1S_0$ channel, we note that the largest relativistic correction of the CTP is of the form

$$-\frac{\pi}{M_N^2}(C_{1S0}+\hat{C}_{1S0})\left(\vec{p}^2+\vec{p}'^2\right). \tag{21}$$

This momentum-dependence term is desired to achieve a reasonable description of the $^1S_0$ channel for momenta around m_π, as shown in the previous studies [49, 50], where the $(\vec{p}^2+\vec{p}'^2)$ term is promoted on phenomenological



FIG. 2: Dependence of $\tilde{\chi}^2$/d.o.f. as a function of the momentum cutoff Λ. The fit is to the $J = 0,\ 1$ partial wave shifts of the np channel with $E_{\rm lab} = 1,\ 5,\ 10,\ 25,\ 50,\ 100$ MeV [47].



FIG. 3: Neutron-proton phase shifts for $J \leq 1$. The red solid lines denote the results from the relativistic chiral NN potential, while the dashed and dotted lines represent the LO and NLO non-relativistic results, respectively. Solid dots and open triangles represent the *np* phase shift analyses of Nijmegen [47] and VPI/GWU [48], respectively. The gray backgrounds denote the energy regions where the theoretical results are predictions.

ground and the dibaryon field is introduced to deal with its resummation. We also note that this term has the same form as the NLO contribution of the NR chiral potential [45]. This indicates that the covariant power counting partially rearranges the contributions of the non-relativistic potential of sub-leading orders to the leading order. The same is true for the other partial wave potentials with $J \leq 1$. This mechanism is also behind the improved description of the $^3P_0$ and $^1P_1$ partial wave phase shifts.

For $^3P_1$ and the coupled $^3S_1$-$^3D_1$partial waves, relativistic corrections are much more suppressed. For instance, the relativistic correction of V_{3D1} is suppressed by $1/M_N^4$ at least. As a result, the description of these partial waves are similar to that of the LO Weinberg approach. In addition, our description of the mixing angle ε_1 is slightly worse than the Weinberg approach because we describe slightly better the $^3S_1$ phase shift, while slightly worse the $^3D_1$ phase shift.

In Fig. 3, the results of the NLO non-relativistic chiral force [45] are presented for comparison. It is clear that the relativistic LO potential provides a description of the partial wave phase shifts with a similar quality as the NLO non-relativistic chiral force, which, however, has four more LECs. One can conclude that the relativistic chiral nuclear force can provide a more efficient description of the phase shifts.

We have checked the cutoff dependence of the aforementioned $^1S_0$ and $^3P_0$ partial waves and we found that both of them are cutoff independent, mainly because of the leading relativistic corrections. This is consistent with Refs. [33, 37] where one introduces an extra $C_{3P0}|\vec{p}||\vec{p}'|$ term in V_{3P0} to achieve cutoff independence, although our scattering equations are different.

Summary and conclusion: We proposed a new covariant scheme to construct the nucleon-nucleon interaction in chiral effective field theory. At leading order of the covariant power counting, the chiral force includes part of sub-leading terms in the non-relativistic construction. This force was shown to lead to a better description of the Nijmegen partial wave phase shifts than the LO Weinberg approach and similar to the next-to-leading order Weinberg approach. Our study showed that Lorentz invariance can provide a powerful constraint in constructing a relativistic nuclear force. This covariant formulation appears to be more efficient than the non-relativistic one and may provide

an essential input to relativistic nuclear structure studies.

We acknowledge the valuable discussions with Ulf-G. Meißner, Evgeny Epelbaum, and Manuel Pavon Valderrama. This work was supported in part by the Major State 973 Program of China under Grant No. 2013CB834400, the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grants No. 11335002, No. 11621131001, No. 11375024, No. 11522539, and No. 11375120, the China Postdoctoral Science Foundation under Grant No. 2016M600845, the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities, and by the DFG cluster of excellence "Origin and Structure of the Universe" (www.universe-cluster.de).

[1] P. Schwerdtfeger, ed., *Relativistic Electornic Structure Theory, Part I. Fundamentals, Theoretical and Computational Chemistry Vol. 11* (Elsevier Science B.V., 2002).
[2] J. Meng, ed., *In Relativistic Density Functional for Nuclear Structure, International Review of Nuclear Physics Vol. 10* (World Scientific, Singapore, 2016).
[3] M. Mayer and J. Jensen, *Elementary Theory of Nuclear Shell Structure*, Structure of matter series (John Wiley & Sons, 1955).
[4] M. Karplus, M. Levitt, and A. Warshel, The Nobel Prize in Chemistry (2013).
[5] S. Elhatisari, D. Lee, G. Rupak, E. Epelbaum, H. Krebs, T. A. Lähde, T. Luu, and U.-G. Meißner, Nature **528**, 111 (2015).
[6] V. Lapoux, V. Somà, C. Barbieri, H. Hergert, J. D. Holt, and S. Stroberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **117**, 052501 (2016).
[7] H. Yukawa, Proc. Phys. Math. Soc. Jap. **17**, 48 (1935), [Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl.1,1(1935)].
[8] V. G. J. Stoks, R. A. M. Klomp, C. P. F. Terheggen, and J. J. de Swart, Phys. Rev. **C49**, 2950 (1994).
[9] R. B. Wiringa, V. G. J. Stoks, and R. Schiavilla, Phys. Rev. **C51**, 38 (1995).
[10] D. R. Entem and R. Machleidt, Phys. Rev. **C68**, 041001 (2003).
[11] E. Epelbaum, W. Glockle, and U.-G. Meißner, Nucl. Phys. **A747**, 362 (2005).
[12] E. Epelbaum, H. Krebs, and U.-G. Meißner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 122301 (2015).
[13] S. Weinberg, Phys. Lett. **B251**, 288 (1990).
[14] S. Weinberg, Nucl. Phys. **B363**, 3 (1991).
[15] P. F. Bedaque and U. van Kolck, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. **52**, 339 (2002).
[16] E. Epelbaum, H.-W. Hammer, and U.-G. Meißner, Rev. Mod. Phys. **81**, 1773 (2009).
[17] R. Machleidt and D. R. Entem, Phys. Rept. **503**, 1 (2011).
[18] R. Machleidt, Adv. Nucl. Phys. **19**, 189 (1989).
[19] R. Machleidt, Phys. Rev. **C63**, 024001 (2001).
[20] F. Gross, J. W. Van Orden, and K. Holinde, Phys. Rev. **C45**, 2094 (1992).
[21] F. Gross and A. Stadler, Phys. Rev. **C78**, 014005 (2008).
[22] B. Ter Haar and R. Malfliet, Phys. Rept. **149**, 207 (1987).
[23] R. Brockmann and R. Machleidt, Phys. Rev. **C42**, 1965 (1990).
[24] S. Shen, J. Hu, H. Liang, J. Meng, P. Ring, and S. Zhang, Chin. Phys. Lett. **33**, 102103 (2016).
[25] S. Weinberg, Physica **A96**, 327 (1979).
[26] E. E. Jenkins and A. V. Manohar, Phys. Lett. **B255**, 558 (1991).
[27] L.-S. Geng, J. Martin Camalich, L. Alvarez-Ruso, and M. J. Vicente Vacas, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 222002 (2008).
[28] X.-L. Ren, L.-S. Geng, J. Martin Camalich, J. Meng, and H. Toki, JHEP **12**, 073 (2012).
[29] A. H. Blin, T. Gutsche, T. Ledwig, and V. E. Lyubovitskij, Phys. Rev. **D92**, 096004 (2015).
[30] D.-L. Yao, D. Siemens, V. Bernard, E. Epelbaum, A. M. Gasparyan, J. Gegelia, H. Krebs, and U.-G. Meißner, JHEP **05**, 038 (2016).
[31] M. Altenbuchinger, L.-S. Geng, and W. Weise, Phys. Rev. **D89**, 014026 (2014).
[32] L.-S. Geng, Front. Phys.(Beijing) **8**, 328 (2013), 1301.6815.
[33] E. Epelbaum and J. Gegelia, Phys. Lett. **B716**, 338 (2012).
[34] K. A. Olive, Chin. Phys. **C40**, 100001 (2016).
[35] L. Girlanda, S. Pastore, R. Schiavilla, and M. Viviani, Phys. Rev. **C81**, 034005 (2010).
[36] J. Goto and S. Machida, Progr. Theor. Phys. **25**, 64 (1961).
[37] A. Nogga, R. G. E. Timmermans, and U. van Kolck, Phys. Rev. **C72**, 054006 (2005).
[38] M. C. Birse, Phys. Rev. **C74**, 014003 (2006).
[39] M. P. Valderrama, Phys. Rev. **C83**, 024003 (2011).
[40] B. Long and C. J. Yang, Phys. Rev. **C86**, 024001 (2012).
[41] E. E. Salpeter and H. A. Bethe, Phys. Rev. **84**, 1232 (1951).
[42] R. Blankenbecler and R. Sugar, Phys. Rev. **142**, 1051 (1966).
[43] V. G. Kadyshevsky, Nucl. Phys. **B6**, 125 (1968).
[44] K.-W. Li, X.-L. Ren, L.-S. Geng, and B. Long, Phys. Rev. **D94**, 014029 (2016).
[45] E. Epelbaum, W. Gloeckle, and U.-G. Meißner, Nucl. Phys. **A671**, 295 (2000).
[46] C. Ordonez, L. Ray, and U. van Kolck, Phys. Rev. **C53**, 2086 (1996).
[47] V. G. J. Stoks, R. A. M. Klomp, M. C. M. Rentmeester, and J. J. de Swart, Phys. Rev. **C48**, 792 (1993).
[48] R. A. Arndt, I. I. Strakovsky, and R. L. Workman, Phys. Rev. **C50**, 2731 (1994).

[49] J. Soto and J. Tarrus, Phys. Rev. **C78**, 024003 (2008).
[50] B. Long, Phys. Rev. **C88**, 014002 (2013).
[51] In practice, the retardation effect is always neglected.
[52] We have checked that our results would remain more or less the same if the BbS equation were used.
[53] For higher partial waves not shown here, to which only the one-pion exchange diagram contribute, our results are similar to those of the modified Weinberg approach [33].